## REMARKS

In the final rejection, claim 10 is grouped with claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, claim 19 is grouped with claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, and claim 22 is grouped with claim 29, claim 22 being dependent on claim 21. Thus, the Examiner's own analysis seems to suggest that the Examiner recognized that claims 10, 19, and 29 should depend from claims 2, 12, and 21, respectively. The present amendment simply seeks to obtain the obviously expected claim scope.

Without the amendment, there appears to be an antecedent basis problem in claims 10, 19, and 29 since there would be no antecedent basis for the signal. Thus, this amendment simply puts the application in better form for consideration on appeal.

Therefore, entry of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: <u>February 16, 2006</u>

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation

6